



# Woods Hole

# Oceanographic Institution



RECEIVED 1982  
OCEANOGRAPHIC INSTITUTION

WORKSHOP ON COOPERATIVE  
INTERNATIONAL MARINE AFFAIRS

by

James Broadus, Robert W. Knecht,  
David A. Ross, Kurt Shusterich  
and Maynard Silva

August 1982

TECHNICAL REPORT

*Prepared by the Marine Policy and Ocean  
Management Program with funds from the  
William H. Donner Foundation, the Pew  
Memorial Trust, and the Johnson Endowment  
Fund.*

WORKSHOP ON COOPERATIVE INTERNATIONAL MARINE AFFAIRS

by

James Broadus, Robert W. Knecht, David A. Ross,  
Kurt Shusterich and Maynard Silva

WOODS HOLE OCEANOGRAPHIC INSTITUTION  
Woods Hole, Massachusetts 02543

August 1982

TECHNICAL REPORT

*Prepared by the Marine Policy and Ocean Management  
Program with funds from the William H. Donner Foundation,  
the Pew Memorial Trust, and the Johnson Endowment Fund.*

*Reproduction in whole or in part is permitted for any  
purpose of the United States Government. This report  
should be cited as: Woods Hole Oceanog. Inst. Tech. Rept.  
WHOI-82-38.*

Approved for distribution:



David A. Ross  
Director  
Marine Policy and Ocean  
Management

## Table of Contents

Introduction.....	2
Purpose of the Workshop.....	3
Workshop Discussions.....	4
Background of the CIMAP Program.....	4
Discussion of Key Issues.....	7
Identifying Potential Partner Countries.....	7
Ascertaining Developing Country Needs.....	11
Shaping the Program.....	14
Conclusions.....	18
Appendix I - List of Participants.....	20-23
Appendix II - Workshop Agenda.....	24-25
Appendix III - Summary of Roundtable Contributions.....	26-36

## INTRODUCTION

This report details the results of a workshop held at the Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution (WHOI) on April 20-21, 1982. The workshop, part of an effort by the Marine Policy and Ocean Management Program (MPOM) of WHOI intended to assist interested developing countries in formulating strategies for ocean resource use and management within their new 200-mile exclusive economic zones. The effort, presently called the Cooperative International Marine Affairs Program (CIMAP), began in November of 1981 after the William H. Donner Foundation of New York City responded favorably to a proposal submitted by Dr. David A. Ross, Director of MPOM.

Following a section on the purpose of the workshop, this report contains two principal sections: 1) Workshop Discussions and 2) Conclusions. Topics covered in the Workshop Discussions section are:

- . Background of the CIMAP program
- . Discussion of Key Issues
  - Identifying Potential Partner Countries
  - Ascertaining Developing Country Needs
  - Shaping the Program

Appendices contain the list of workshop participants, the agenda, and a summary of roundtable contributions.

## PURPOSE OF THE WORKSHOP

Shortly after the grant award, members of the MPOM Program staff prepared a "strawman" or provisional program design to test the compatibility and soundness of the particular program elements and approaches under discussion. The "strawman" focussed on the Caribbean as an initial region for consideration and included criteria for evaluating potential partners, mechanisms for transferring marine policy and technical-scientific expertise to developing coastal states, the nature of the expertise to be transferred, and methods for evaluating the success of the Program.

Based on the comments and criticisms of an internal review, the "strawman" was revised and became known as the Program Development Plan (PDP). The PDP described a direct institution-to-government relationship consisting of two separable stages: 1) emphasis on general education in marine policy problems and institutions through a series of workshops and lectures; 2) provision of expert training and assistance on pressing marine problems in the partner country. The issue as to which of these stages would receive the greater emphasis was unresolved, but the problem of generating funding support, especially for the more open-ended second stage activities, was identified.

Further modifications of the PDP resulted in a growing awareness by the Steering Group that no single document can function as a universal blueprint for this Program. The Program design must be flexible and adaptable to the needs and opportunities that arise with each partner country. After revision, the PDP was distributed to a small number of non-MPOM individuals having developing country expertise for review and comment.

After the second revision of the PDP, the Steering Group felt ready to give these ideas wider exposure. It was decided that the most efficient way to achieve this was to convene a small number of individuals with appropriate backgrounds and experience at a Woods Hole workshop. The Steering Group was convinced that the program design concepts contained in the PDP would benefit from a discussion of the mistakes made and lessons learned by others in the marine science and policy training development assistance field.

A group of about 15 individuals representing international development assistance programs and marine science and resource interests was assembled here on April 20-21, 1982. They were joined by about 15 staff members from MPOM and another 4-5 from other WHOI departments. A list of workshop participants and the agenda are attached to this report. The general aims of the workshop were as follows:

- . review the nature of marine policy needs for developing countries
- . discuss the kinds of programs necessary to meet those needs
- . review the kind of program WHOI can best undertake
- . review, refine and extend the draft PDP.

#### WORKSHOP DISCUSSIONS

The material below was abstracted from presentations and discussions at the workshop.

#### Background of the CIMAP Program

The Cooperative International Marine Affairs Program is one of the major research themes of the Marine Policy and Ocean Management Program of the Woods

Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution. MPOM supports marine policy research through the appointment of Research Fellows, usually with professional degrees in various fields of social science (such as economics, geography or anthropology) or law who study marine-related problems within their speciality, occasionally as part of a team. The Marine Policy Program also has a small, permanent staff, Policy Associates, and, occasionally, more experienced individuals who are appointed as Senior Fellows. The exposure of social scientists to the scientific environment of Woods Hole is often beneficial for the development and formulation of their research as well as for their later professional careers. Most MPOM activities are in four principal areas: coastal management and marine pollution; fisheries management; marine mining; and cooperative international marine affairs policy.

An initial motivation for the establishment of the Marine Policy Program was the realization that research in the ocean was being affected by conditions beyond the control of scientists; in particular, the changing legal regime of the ocean and the increase in ocean development and use. The Third U.N. Conference on the Law of the Sea (UNCLOS III) and the recent LOS Draft Convention underscore these changes.

The setting for the Cooperative International Marine Affairs Program was established several years ago when it became evident that developed countries could and would be expected to assist developing countries to study, ascertain, and develop their marine potential. This potential is not limited simply to mineral resources such as oil but also involves coastal zone development and management, fishery resources, harbor development, tourism and the like. It should be appreciated that approximately 42% of the ocean, an

area larger than the present land area, will or has come under coastal state control, and that over 90 of the coastal states are developing countries in the marine science sense. It is in the interest of all concerned to see an orderly development of ocean space by developing and developed countries. Within MPOM we felt that many initial decisions a developing country might make concerning its use of the ocean would be more influenced by political and economic considerations than by scientific and technical concerns, in part because of the paucity of data or the imbalance in the available information.

With these thoughts in mind a proposal was submitted to the William H. Donner Foundation and, a two-year grant was awarded to develop a plan for assisting selected developing countries with existing or potential marine resource management problems. Our major goal is to develop and implement the plan in one or more countries. The Donner award has been supplemented by support from the Pew Memorial Trust, the Johnson Endowment Fund and more recently from funds from Sea Grant, NOAA, Department of Commerce.

The Steering Group of CIMAP is chaired by Mr. Robert Knecht, who also chaired this Workshop, assisted by Drs. James Broadus, Kurt Shusterich and Maynard Silva. Dr. Shusterich, in particular, arranged the logistics for the workshop; Drs. Broadus and Silva were primarily responsible for the development of the Program Development Plan (PDP). Miss Katharine Wellman was the research assistant for the workshop, and Ms. Charlene Lewis handled the general administrative matters. We were fortunate to have Dr. Richard Meunier with us as a Guest Investigator during that time commenting on and reviewing the PDP. Other outside reviewers included Dr. Carl Berg of the Marine Biological Laboratory (MBL) and Dr. Edward Towle of the Island Resources



Foundation (IRF). We also benefited from many past studies and from the soon-to-be-published Marine Technical Assistance Group (MTAG) Report of the National Academy of Sciences.

#### DISCUSSION OF KEY ISSUES

Three issues discussed at the workshop that seemed most important in terms of the design of CIMAP are: identifying potential partner countries, ascertaining developing country needs, and shaping the program. The flavor of the workshop discussion of each of these, together with suggestions and recommendations that seemed to have the general support of the workshop as a whole, follow.

##### Identifying Potential Partner Countries

One of the most important decisions for our Program is to identify potential partner countries. These decisions are influenced by many factors including the overall strategy of MPOM and CIMAP, the people and talent of MPOM and outside participants, our ultimate goals, funding, and, interest from potential participant countries. Our initial contacts have informed us that several opportunities outside of our original program concept already exist. However, within the framework of our Donner effort we are proceeding with a structured effort initially focussing on just one or two countries.

The first recommendation of the workshop is that a high degree of flexibility be maintained in any effort. The second is that the importance of partner country participation in the design and implementation of a program be

fully recognized. There was considerable discussion during the workshop about the importance of an early success demonstrating the Program's goals and aims. Success will depend upon the breadth of the problem we first attack and thus the consensus was that rather than first working with a country that has a multiplicity of urgent marine problems that we choose among countries or regions (such as small islands) that have only one or two pressing marine resource management problems.

Another strong recommendation was that a visit by an MPOM team to a prospective country should be made very early in the planning process. The possibility of inviting leaders from different countries to Woods Hole to discuss their interests and needs was also discussed; other mechanisms are discussed in later paragraphs. We were advised that as potential partner countries are identified, it would be valuable to develop a "planning paper" based on what we know about each country, for example using information from the U.S. State Department, the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), and from international organizations such as the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO), World Bank, etc. However, we were cautioned not to rely on these broad statistics; several examples of gross levels of error were given. Thus it is important to balance enthusiasm for an early start with the need for having as full a set of information as possible. We should examine the data sets critically and make sure that we get a good country profile before a final agreement is reached.

Another important discussion centered on the duration of a program. Short-term projects focussing on one issue can be worthwhile and often have good potential for success. However, it is clear that longer-term efforts may

be necessary for a meaningful and lasting contribution. In both instances, our interactions, research, etc. would involve natural scientists from WHOI.

There was a general discussion on the use of the term "policy" in approaching prospective partners. Policy usually involves the establishment of priorities and compromises, and national or regional value judgements. National "policy" clearly brings in factors beyond the scope of our Program. It was argued that we shouldn't use the word "policy" in describing our effort since policy-making is the prerogative of the political leadership within the country. Better terminology might be "technical assistance in the formulation of policy options or alternatives", since our first emphasis should be on assisting the partner country to review its options in a rational way.

Other factors could influence our choice of partners. If an institution or country approaches us with marine-related problems that appear to fit our capability, a program could develop. This has happened many times at this Institution, and groups attracted by marine science opportunities at WHOI may discover CIMAP and what it has to offer. Another influence, though not direct or explicit, relates to the location and nature of U.S. government programs. For example, the recent Caribbean initiative, may provide enthusiasm for work in this region. Likewise, related activities and interests of NSF or NOAA in specific regions conceivably could influence our decisions.

In terms of informing potential "second round" partner countries of the existence of our Program, several suggestions were discussed at some length. One approach involves our participation in the periodic meetings of a regional organization such as CARICOM (The Caribbean Common Market Community). At a conference of this sort, with possibilities for similar ones in West Africa

and elsewhere, we might be able to benefit from formal or institutionalized conference frameworks to accomplish several goals. A brief presentation of the Program at a heads-of-government type meeting would familiarize leaders of a given region of possibilities and capabilities for assistance in marine resource issues. Furthermore, this would be an excellent forum to discuss the close linkages between the overall development goals of a country and a well-managed marine resource development program. In addition, we would learn of the potential marine issues in a particular region as perceived by political leaders. Another benefit of this approach is that once the conference had ended and one or more country leaders responded on an individual basis regarding a cooperative effort, we might have a more detailed basis on which to establish the firmness and intent of the potential partner.

A second approach would involve a WHOI-sponsored meeting in a given region to which institutions and upper-level administrators and leaders would be invited. Such a "symposium" might be 2 or 3 days in length and might come about as a result of a decision taken at the higher political-level conference mentioned above.

Some participants warned that we should be fairly certain of the desirability of a country's participation before making full formal contact, or at least not give the impression of guaranteed partnership at too early a stage. It was also suggested that the CIMAP initiative be aware of existing ties in the potential partner country with other U.S. government and institutional efforts.

Several participants made it clear that it is essential to have high-level political involvement, or at least awareness and support. We were

also made aware that in many Latin American countries the navy plays a very influential role in marine resource and ocean development matters. Clearly, contacts between CIMAP and a partner country's navy would be valuable in establishing a successful cooperative effort in many Latin American countries.

Regardless of method of partner selection it was agreed that resources would be needed on both sides in order to make the effort a success. One obvious resource required is funding. One participant pointed out that a host country's basic participation involving their experienced staff, etc. would in reality, be a very significant cost to that country.

Overall, there was a general consensus on the need to be flexible in selecting a partner as each country has unique characteristics, though there should still be a framework to guide in the selection process. There was also a broad consensus on the need for CIMAP to avoid a "missionary" appearance in approaching countries and to assure that any effort be a truly cooperative one.

#### Ascertaining Developing Country Needs

Prior to the workshop, those involved with CIMAP had two central questions about the resource management needs of developing coastal states: 1) do they in fact need the assistance we are prepared to offer; and 2) if they do need assistance, what is the nature of those needs? Both of these questions were posed to the workshop participants.

There was general agreement that developing countries could benefit from the Program. In any region of the developing world, one is likely to encounter the wide-range of problems associated with various types of marine

resource development efforts. As with the developed world, developing coastal states have OCS oil and gas development, fisheries management problems, coastal zones impacted by urban development, waste disposal problems, potential boundary disputes, tourism issues and the like.

The most emphatic position taken by the workshop vis-a-vis developing coastal state needs was that we can not expect the needs of each country to be identical, although many will be similar. Some will require "umbrella" training in marine policy, resource management and policy alternatives; others will be desirous of technical aid to solve specific, well-defined marine resource development problems. Therefore, the Program must remain flexible in the types of issues it is designed to address and in the way the problems, as defined by the partner country, will be remedied.

In addition to the above areas of general consensus, at least two of the workshop participants suggested six other categories of developing coastal state marine policy needs. First among these was the perceived need for marine policy "institution building". In most cases this would not mean the creation of new institutions or organizations, but rather the improvement and strengthening of those already in place. It was suggested that in order for institution building to occur, many developing coastal states first need to increase the awareness of the contribution marine resources can make to national development -- indigenous institutions need assistance in promoting the importance of these resources to the general populace and politicians not normally concerned with marine resource issues. Institution building can also be facilitated by the training of planners who are inexperienced in marine resource matters. Many developing countries have professionals with technical

expertise, but not as applied to marine resources. A reorientation of their professional interest and expertise to the marine field could be of great value. One way this can be done is through the system of higher education; "redirected professors can pass a marine orientation" on to their students -- in essence providing a multiplier effect. It was also suggested that these countries need to develop the capacity to effectively respond to outside development funding opportunities.

Second, it was pointed out by some (partially as a criticism of the PDP) that the important developing country needs are primarily long-term and critical to the development needs of the country. Beyond this, developing countries need to put in place on-going arrangements to carry through initiatives which are given impetus by first contacts with technical transfer programs.

Third, developing coastal states were seen as needing assistance in establishing resource development priorities. The countries with which we are concerned could benefit from the transfer of expertise that would enable them to evaluate ocean resources or uses most appropriate for and conducive to their overall economic growth. Some felt that the emphasis should be on helping to identify underutilized resources most readily exploitable.

Fourth, several participants stressed that developing coastal states need, above all else, and regardless of the specific problem, "appropriate" technology. They require education and/or training in methods or techniques which will not stress their limited economic resources.

Fifth, some suggested that a major problem confronting developing countries attempting to manage their ocean resources is a lack of accurate

information and data upon which policy makers can base their decisions. Thus, the need is for training in the scientific collection, management and use of data i.e., the creation of a "data infrastructure". If a country does not have the resources or personnel to develop a data collection system, then the need is for training in how to get the optimum use out of what does exist, or what information the country is capable of generating.

Finally, a few of the participants felt that awareness of the regional nature of marine resource development problems is essential. By working together, two or more countries within a region may be able to alleviate problems which individually they could not overcome.

#### Shaping the Program

Flexibility and customization were stressed by the workshop participants as the most important features to strive for in general design of the Program. Flexibility is important: (1) to allow the Program to serve a variety of different partner country relationships, whether these be arrived at systematically or serendipitously; and (2) to provide scope for tailor-making Program elements to suit the interests and capabilities of partner countries. A strong consensus was apparent in the workshop on the importance of custom designing each transfer effort to meet the specific needs and interest of the partner state.

To maintain flexibility, it was suggested that WHOI be prepared to present a prospective partner with a broad "menu" of potential Program elements. This menu should encompass all uses of the oceans and not be limited only to physical resources. An "off-the-shelf" entry in this menu,



which might be developed initially without reference to any one partner's particular interests, would be a standardized package of education materials forming the basis for a collapsible/expandable "survey" of marine affairs issues and institutions. This survey should be designed in such a way that it could be easily presented in overview during a single 1-2 hour session or in greater detail over an expanded sequence of 1-3 weeks. It should also permit the possibility of expanding any component topic into a longer, more specialized sequence. Topics that might be addressed in the survey include: fishing (commercial, subsistence, and sport); recreation; tourism; use of the oceans for disposal of wastes; shipping; mineral resources (hydrocarbons, metals, others); marine science; energy; defense; and international cooperation.

Flexibility in Program design was also considered important to maintain the possibility of regional or subregional transfer efforts. Such efforts could stand alone as useful in their own right, and could also lead to further bilateral or multilateral relationships.

Everyone agreed that the Program's long-term effectiveness and chances for survival would depend on the success of the first effort. Therefore, there was some feeling that, in designing the Program's initial effort, WHOI should tend to favor a cooperative attack on a well-defined specific problem that could show tangible results in a relatively short period of time. Attention to related problems and more general issues might then follow, with the Program's focus broadening outward from the original problem. Most participants seemed to agree that it would be more difficult to establish the Program's value on the basis of a more general "umbrella" educational effort

in marine affairs (though, depending on the interests of the partner, such an approach might be most appropriate). One suggestion for meshing the two approaches was that the more general format be employed in a regional forum, with the possibility of "spin-off" bilateral or multilateral efforts directed at particular problems of major interest.

Because of the importance of customizing each transfer effort to meet the needs of the partner country, it is crucial that the Program's "Initial Phase" be approached carefully and completed successfully. This is the stage where Program staff meet with sponsors from the partner country to arrive at a mutually agreeable and appropriate design for that particular relationship. From the outset of this Initial Phase, it is important not to raise false expectations on the part of prospective partners. This Initial Phase would probably be most useful and productive if conducted "on site" in the partner country. At the end of this phase, and before commencement of any direct Program activities, Program staff and the partner country should share an unambiguous understanding of exactly what will be provided as part of the Program, what the objectives of these activities are, who will be providing which of the necessary resources, and what conditions and procedures will be required to continue with subsequent cooperative efforts.

Workshop participants emphasized that, if it is to be met receptively by prospective partners, the Program should not be oriented around "environmental" and associated issues but rather should be directed toward "development potential". This orientation need not exclude consideration of any important environmental issues; it is simply a question of emphasis.

As for the composition of the Programs' personnel pool, it was generally agreed that the Program should include scope for participation by experts from beyond Woods Hole. Thus, the Program should be multidisciplinary and should rely substantially on a pool of "stringers" with specialities in potentially relevant fields from both the social and physical sciences.

Some participants anticipated that one element in the Program "menu" likely to be widely demanded by partner states is assistance with the management of relevant information. Therefore, the Program should expect and be prepared to assist in identifying information needs, in conducting a rough survey and evaluation of existing sources of information, and in upgrading those sources where appropriate.

Dissatisfaction or discomfort with "Workshops" as a useful transfer medium was also expressed by some participants. "Development Assistance" relationships, in which Program staff and Participants from partner countries work together directly in the field, were suggested as possibly more productive formats for meaningful transfer. In this mode, the Program could act as a kind of short-term, "extension service".

There was also some feeling that the Program should be prepared to promote "public education" and "awareness raising" among the general public and key public officials on the importance of marine affairs for national development. Such activities would occur as an adjunct to the Program's direct transfer efforts, but there was a sense that the direct transfer efforts might prove to be less productive without such general education.

Whatever the speculation about how individual Programs might be more usefully designed, however, there was unequivocal agreement that they must be

tailor-made to the needs and interests of each Partner; and those needs and interests will not be known until discussions with prospective partners have been concluded. Even then, a variety of needs and interests are likely to be encountered. At this stage the Program should attempt to maintain maximum flexibility rather than becoming locked into any one format.

### CONCLUSIONS

While the workshop did not consider a formal set of conclusions or recommendations, a reasonable consensus developed around the following points:

1. Each cooperative program should be hand-tailored to the partner country's individual needs.
2. The initial partner country should be selected on the basis of providing a good example of what the cooperative program can deliver.
3. While the first partner should present a range of marine policy problems and opportunities, the chances of success with at least one concrete, important problem should be high.
4. The first partner country should be in the mid-range in terms of "marine sophistication" and infrastructure - i.e., with some marine awareness and organization (beyond fisheries alone) and yet not developed beyond the point where our assistance would be helpful.
5. The potential partner should be reasonably prepared to engage in the follow-up activities arising from the initial project.
6. Donor agencies in the development assistance field (i.e., U.S.A.I.D. or one of the development banks) involved with the partner country

should be made aware of the Program and should indicate interest in (and the possibility of support for) development projects that result from the Program.

7. A regional approach should be considered in the eastern (largely English-speaking) Caribbean and, perhaps as well, in the western (Latin-American) Caribbean as a way of disseminating information about the Program and assisting in the selection of second round partner countries.
8. A flexible approach should be used in formulating the training and instructional components of the Program in order to be prepared to take advantage of the widely varying kinds of opportunities for marine policy training assistance which will, given the nature of WHOI, present themselves from time to time during the course of the Program.

In the months immediately ahead, the Program will be working toward the selection of an initial partner country and the development, in close cooperation with that partner country, of a marine policy assistance program. Information on the status of the effort and copies of program documents such as the PDP can be obtained by contacting the Marine Policy and Ocean Management Program, Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution, Woods Hole, Massachusetts 02543. (617) 548-1400, extn. 2449.

## APPENDIX I

## LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

CIMAP WORKSHOP PARTICIPANTS  
VISITORS

Ms. Dorothy M. Bjur  
University of Southern California  
Institute for Marine Coastal Studies  
Denny Research Center  
Los Angeles, CA 90007

Mr. Burdick Brittin  
Advisor on Ocean Issues  
1030 Millwood Road  
Great Falls, VA 22066

Mr. Melvin A. Conant  
Conant and Associates, Ltd.  
9901 Phoenix Lane  
Great Falls, VA 22066

Mr. William Erb  
Office of Marine Science and Technology  
Affairs  
OES/OMS, Room 5801  
Department of State  
Washington, D.C. 20252

Lt. Commander Luis Gonzalez  
Ecuador Mission to the United Nations  
U.N. Plaza  
New York, NY 10017

Mr. Robert R. Lankford  
IOCARIBE Regional Secretary  
UNDP Apartado Postal 4540  
San Jose, Costa Rica

Dr. Nelson Marshall  
Graduate School of Oceanography  
University of Rhode Island  
Bay Campus  
Narragansett, RI 02882

Mr. Lawrence D. Neuman  
United Nations Ocean Economics and  
Technology Branch  
One United Nations Plaza, DC 1084  
New York, NY 10017

Mr. Robert O. Otto  
Chief Environmental Officer  
LAC/DR Room 2252  
New State Department Building  
Agency for International Development (AID)  
Washington, DC 20523

Dr. Francisco J. Palacio  
Tinker Center for Tropical Marine  
Coastal Studies in Latin America  
University of Miami  
4600 Rickenbacker Causeway  
Miami, FL 33149

Dr. Richard B. Pollnac  
Department of Sociology and Anthropology  
502 Chafee Building  
University of Rhode Island  
Kingston, RI 02881

Dr. Harris B. Stewart, Jr.  
Center for Marine Studies  
School of Sciences and Health  
Professions  
Old Dominion University  
Norfolk, VA 23508

Dr. Ed Towle  
Island Resources Foundation  
1718 P. St., N.W. Suite L-8  
Washington, DC 20036

Ms. Stella Maris Vallejo  
United Nations Ocean Economics and  
Technology Branch  
One United Nations Plaza, DC-1-94  
New York, NY 10017

Mr. Horace Walters  
Fisheries Development Officer  
St. Lucia

CIMAP WORKSHOP PARTICIPANTS  
WOODS HOLE OCEANOGRAPHIC INSTITUTION  
WOODS HOLE, MASSACHUSETTS 02543

Dr. Robert Bowen  
Research Fellow  
Marine Policy and Ocean Management Program

Dr. James Broadus  
Research Fellow  
Marine Policy and Ocean Management Program

Dr. Paul Fye  
President  
Board of Trustees  
Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution

Dr. Charles Hollister  
Dean of Graduate Studies  
Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution

Mr. Robert Knecht  
Senior Fellow  
Marine Policy and Ocean Management Program

Ms. Ethel LeFave  
Secretary  
Marine Policy and Ocean Management Program

Dr. Thomas Leschine  
Policy Associate  
Marine Policy and Ocean Management Program

Ms. Charlene Lewis  
Marine Policy Administrator  
Marine Policy and Ocean Management Program

Dr. Russell McGoodwin  
Guest Investigator, MP&OM  
Department of Anthropology, Campus Box 233  
University of Colorado  
Boulder, CO 80309



Dr. Richard Meunier  
Guest Investigator  
Marine Policy and Ocean Management Program

Mr. J. Lawrence Peirson  
Assistant Dean, Education  
Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution

Dr. Susan Peterson  
Policy Associate  
Marine Policy and Ocean Management Program

Dr. Richard Price  
Policy Associate  
Marine Policy and Ocean Management Program

Dr. David A. Ross  
Director  
Marine Policy and Ocean Management Program

Dr. Kurt Shusterich  
Research Fellow  
Marine Policy and Ocean Management Program

Dr. Maynard Silva  
Research Fellow  
Marine Policy and Ocean Management Program

Dr. David Watters  
Research Fellow  
Marine Policy and Ocean Management Program

Ms. Katherine Wellman  
Research Assistant  
Marine Policy and Ocean Management Program

## APPENDIX II

COOPERATIVE INTERNATIONAL MARINE AFFAIRS WORKSHOP

WOODS HOLE OCEANOGRAPHIC INSTITUTION  
 Woods Hole, Massachusetts 02543  
 (617) 548-1400

April 20-21, 1982

AGENDA

April 20th (Tuesday)

1. Participants arrive in morning
2. Hotel check-in Coonamessett Inn (Falmouth)\*
3. Transportation from hotel to Carriage House 11:30 a.m.
4. Welcome and lunch Carriage House 12-1 p.m.
5. SETTING THE STAGE
  - The WHOI Marine Policy and Ocean Management Program
  - The Cooperative International Marine Affairs (CIMAP) Program developed thus far
  - Goals for the workshop
  - Identification of key issues, questions, and parameters for a program like CIMAP
  - Round Table Discussion, (each participant will be asked to briefly comment on key issues, -- five to ten minute summary)
  - Identification of specific issues for next day's meetings' modification of agenda based on participant comments
6. Adjournment 5:00 p.m.
7. Transportation from Carriage House to Hotel 5:15 p.m.
8. Dinner 7:00 p.m.

---

\*Coonamessett Inn  
 Jones Road  
 Falmouth, MA 02540  
 (617) 548-2300

AGENDA (Continued)

(Day Two)

April 21st (Wednesday)

- |    |                                                                      |                |              |
|----|----------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------|--------------|
| 1. | Breakfast/hotel check out                                            |                | 7-8:30 a.m.  |
| 2. | Transportation from hotel to Carriage House                          |                | 8:30 a.m.    |
| 3. | <u>THE ISSUES</u>                                                    | Carriage House | 9-12:00 a.m. |
|    | Discussion of key issues, such as:                                   |                |              |
|    | --Developing country needs                                           |                |              |
|    | --Policy training vs. specific technical assistance                  |                | Coffee       |
|    | --Appropriate goals for WHOI program                                 |                | Break        |
|    | --Relation to other programs                                         |                | 10:30-10:45  |
|    | (including U.S. government)                                          |                |              |
|    | --Review of relevant participant experience                          |                |              |
|    | --etc.                                                               |                |              |
| 4. | Conclusion of morning session                                        |                | 12:00 noon   |
| 5. | Lunch                                                                | Carriage House | 12-1 p.m.    |
| 6. | <u>IMPLICATIONS OF THE PROGRAM</u>                                   | Carriage House | 1-4 p.m.     |
|    | --Overall design of program                                          |                |              |
|    | --Program goals/objectives                                           |                |              |
|    | --Resources likely to be needed                                      |                |              |
|    | --Country selection; possible partners                               |                |              |
|    | --Program evaluation criteria                                        |                |              |
|    | --etc.                                                               |                |              |
| 7. | Adjournment                                                          |                | 4:00 p.m.    |
| 8. | Transportation from Carriage House<br>to Logan International Airport |                | 4:15 p.m.    |

## APPENDIX III

Summary of Round Table Contributions

Each participant was asked to comment on the key issues affecting the development of a program on international development assistance. The following are some the highlights as recorded by C. Lewis and T. Wellman.

RUSSELL McGOODWIN (Department of Anthropology, University of Colorado) believed that in selecting an initial partner we should choose a country with large-scale, general problems that cut across a broad spectrum of needs. This initial relationship could then serve as a model for other countries who could see the kinds of assistance being offered and how it related to their own needs.

DOROTHY BJUR (University of Southern California, Institute for Marine Coastal Studies) stressed use of a multi-disciplinary approach that is not necessarily confined to WHOI. It is important to find personnel who actually fit a particular problem, i.e., specialists in international relations, development administration, economics, biology and so forth.

STELLA VALLEJO (United Nations, Ocean Economics and Technology Branch) cited the importance of making initial contact with the institutions most directly concerned with marine affairs, from the political level to the implementation level. Pointing to the United Nations experience in Ecuador, she explained that they worked with the Ecuadorian Navy as their national counterpart, as well as in close contact with the NPO and all ministries with marine related interests. Dealing with the/or at the level of the NPO would

"open the doors" to the partner country's institutional framework - to those offices related collaterally to marine affairs and to individuals working at the project level. She suggested using the "top down" approach in terms of marine policy. Policy will be defined at the highest level of government and marine issues will soon be priority concerns with the developing countries, if they are not so already. We may not have the support of decision-makers if we go in at the grass roots level. There is a real need to insert the marine dimension into existing development programs. If there is to be support for implementing policies to deal with existing problems, that support will have to originate at the highest levels of the government. The outcome will be most successful if we can work with an individual who has expertise at the problem level and has the political support of the government.

HORACE WALTERS (Fisheries Development Officer, St. Lucia) emphasized the need to inform the political directorate in each country of the Program. He suggested we hold a 1-3 day workshop in the next 3-4 months with approximately 50 representatives from developing countries in the Lesser Antilles.

Representatives would come from central planning units, fisheries offices, and port authority, environmental and health departments. The workshop would be a good opportunity to let these people know what we have to offer in marine policy training. It would force people to look at problems that exist now as well as make them aware of the kinds of problems that could develop in the next 2 to 3 years. The country representatives could go back home having been exposed to the importance of preparing a statement of problems and needs. A number of the Caribbean islands are not now ready to deal with questions of needs; they would need time to prepare. A 1-3 day workshop scheduled for some

time after the Caribbean Heads of Government Conference would give each participating country time to prepare a comprehensive document stating its needs. The preparation of such a document would be advantageous in and of itself as the country would be forced to consider its policy problems.

RICHARD MEUNIER (MPOM) felt it would be useful for the development of the international program to obtain feedback on the need for the policy analysis skills that MPOM can offer. This feedback would help us define how to apply our expertise and the mechanism by which we can tap expertise available at scientific institutions similar to WHOI. A workshop such as that suggested by Horace Walters would be instrumental in helping to resolve this question. The interchange with developing countries would help us to evaluate our capabilities to meet individual country needs.

JAMES BROADUS (MPOM) cautioned against over emphasizing the talent or training constraints. We have the skill to find the necessary people. We can expand our stable of experts.

THOMAS LESCHINE (MPOM) pointed out that before developing a Program we must answer the questions: "What is a marine policy problem?" and "What kinds of things are we prepared to deal with"?

BURDICK BRITTIN (Advisor on Ocean Issues) stated that while proper emphasis has been placed on the need to facilitate research on resources and coastal processes it would be erroneous to limit our endeavor to those areas of concern. For example, pollution control needs to be emphasized; boundary disputes will be important issues. The development of a comprehensive national ocean policy is something we can work on as progress is made. It is

best to proceed on a national ocean policy only when a firm base of facts has been established.

LUIS GONZALEZ (Ecuador Mission to the United Nations) felt it will be necessary to place a high priority on the requests emanating from the political infra-structure. However, many political systems in the Caribbean are unstable. While politicians want to be "doers", we must remember that they may not be in power 2 years from now. We will have to plan on a short-term commitment and at the same time, devise a system to keep programs dealing with problems on-going and to see that policies dealing with problems are applied. Sub-regional and regional programs are very useful. Organizations at this level can deal with problems in a number of countries. Navies, because of their research missions, are important organizations that should be taken into account. We should be cautious about setting up a formalized written agreement at an early stage because so little will be known about the partner country. Have an expert visit the potential partner country prior to making any agreements, and have "follow-up" mechanisms in place to ensure as much as possible that the program will continue even though the government may change.

ROBERT OTTO (Chief Environmental Officer, Agency for International Development) suggested we consider the possibility of using non-governmental organizations (i.e., environmental groups, fisheries managers) as contacts. These groups tend to be more stable than governments and as such could serve as additional links to the country. However, non-government organizations are often unable to do much in the way of policy implementation. It would be a mistake to deal with countries on policy issues and not go through

politicians. We must be careful to avoid creating ill-will at the outset. For an organization such as AID, it is particularly important to work through the in-place political structure .

WILLIAM ERB (Office of Marine Science and Technology Affairs, Department of State) pointed out that each country and government we are considering is unique. Getting the governments' blessing on any first step and developing a set of mutual expectations are essential if the program is to succeed.

RICHARD POLLNAC (Department of Anthropology, University of Rhode Island) questioned the advisability of holding another workshop. They can be expensive; they have been held before. Duplication of effort could be avoided by looking at the results of previous workshops and ascertaining country needs from those proceedings. In many parts of the developing world, many aspects of marine policy have international implications. In recognition of this, perhaps we should develop a regional approach rather than focus on an individual country. A region could be identified and an expert or team of experts then sent to gather data, assess the quality of the data base, and work up profiles of relevant agencies. The team would have to be especially sensitive to potential inter-agency rivalries.

CHARLES HOLLISTER (WHOI) proposed the establishment of a Caribbean based center for cooperative exchange and training, a mini-version of the Hawaii based East-West Center. The proposed center would be administered by MPOM, already experienced in integrating science and policy matters. Each WHOI scientific department could be represented and an annual meeting of approximately 10 days duration would be initiated as a mechanism for bringing together scientists, politicians and policy specialists.



HORACE WALTERS did not believe the yearly workshop approach would work. The people from the developing countries who should be involved are civil servants. These are the people we will want to sensitize to marine policy issues. We would never be able to get politicians to come to a 10 day workshop where individual scientists discuss topics not related to the politicians' area of interest. It would be preferable to first take a broad look at policy questions.

LAWRENCE NEUMAN (United Nations Ocean Economics and Technology Branch) cited the importance of using existing institutions and mechanisms. For example, the Economic Commission of Latin America will discuss the EEZ and its potential effects; the CCOP has been set up by UNEP to look for offshore minerals. Many of the smaller Caribbean Islands have common problems which might suggest utilization of a regional approach. If a transfer program is to be successful it must leave behind some on-going projects. For example, the Institute of Marine Affairs, Trinidad/Tobago consists of approximately 100 individuals with on-going research programs. Our Program must choose some existing, critical issues and work outward from the reactive to the predictive, from nearshore problems to EEZ; increase the awareness and interest of the developing country contacts - from working people to politicians; emphasize the potential economic opportunities; downplay conservation and environmental issues at the start.

JAKE PEIRSON (WHOI) commented that the importance of projecting the right image from the start cannot be over emphasized. Education is the key to sustaining results when there is political instability.

MELVIN CONANT (Conant and Associates, Ltd.) stated that adequate staffing is essential if we are to begin and sustain such a large project. WHOI personnel involved with the transfer program also have major on-going scientific projects. Do they have the time and energy for this project as well? Funding will also affect the size and success of any proposed program. Unless we can go to a possible partner country with realistic funding in hand or in prospect, the program will not succeed. Sources of international funding will be contracting. We must guard against raising false expectations in the partner country. It might be a good idea to use the phrase "technical assistance in the formulation of policy options or alternatives" for "policy". "Policy" is the prerogative of the person in power. Good policy is our objective; usually it is also the objective of the politicians; but they must feel they are deciding what policy to enact. The PDP is an extremely comprehensive document with awareness of the need for flexibility apparent throughout.

HARRIS STEWART (Center for Marine Studies, Old Dominion University) suggested using "symposium" rather than "workshop". We will need input from developing countries if we are to correctly ascertain their needs. An invitation could be sent to various Caribbean countries announcing a conference or symposium at which papers would be given concerning "marine policy." This would provide the LDCs with the opportunity to meet our people and hear what we have to offer. Country representatives will return home and brief their governments which can then contact us if they believe we can assist them. We might wish to consult the list prepared by Bob Abel of

approximately 60 individuals with backgrounds in marine affairs who are interested in working overseas, especially in the Caribbean.

ROBERT LANKFORD (IOCARIBE Regional Secretary, Costa Rica) pointed out that the IOCARIBE Program provides for regular marine science activities, support functions, training and educational and mutual assistance, and all on a regional basis. The coastal states do not necessarily see themselves as "maritime" states. Caribbean nations are traditionally terrestrial-based with few commitments to increasing involvement in marine affairs. Lack of communication is a critical problem. Trinidad and Tobago, with its Institute of Marine Affairs and public education program, is the only island country that has shifted its focus to the sea successfully and developed a commitment to marine affairs. It is important to avoid the "missionary" approach. Once needs have been ascertained, an appropriate transfer system must be devised. Our 'filtering' system must be well thought out; there will be individuals who will play along with us to benefit themselves and their own organizations. We should consider using existing institutions such as IOCARIBE which has experience, contacts and knowledge of the region. It was emphasized again that 'environmental' management and 'conservation' are concepts limited to the well-off and well-fed.

WILLIAM ERB stated that our desire or goal is to transfer the marine policy making process to a country. The country itself should decide what policy problem it wishes to attack. We can assist the partner country in setting priorities. The Caribbean is not a scientifically sophisticated region. Greater U.S. research interests have been identified for the Western Pacific and West Africa. The individuals who will be involved in the

continuing portions of the program will likely be scientists. Therefore, successful development of cooperative marine science programs will depend on getting U.S. scientists involved. We must seriously consider whether or not to put money and time into a country that is unattractive scientifically. Let's not forget that Trinidad/Tobago imposed a ban on publications by U.S. scientists. On the other hand this might be the type of policy decision we might wish to consider and attempt to change.

ROBERT OTTO suggested setting up collaborative arrangements with organizations that have worked on development and management issues - organizations such as Caribbean Environmental Action Program, Eastern Caribbean Area Management Program, and the Center for Integrated Resource Management, Puerto Rico. These organizations might also be willing to serve as "host" for a symposium or workshop.

ED TOWLE (Island Resources Foundation) offered that individual country Central Planning Agencies (CPAs) are important contact points. One weakness of the CPA's is the usual lack of a professional trained in marine issues. We should emphasize the development and identification of underutilized resources. Emphasis on this kind of development is weak in the PDP especially as regards the identification of unused and high return opportunities. Even though we choose to work with one partner country, we will probably end up working on some problems that are regional in character.

FRANCISCO PALACIO (Tinker Center for Tropical Marine Coastal Studies in Latin America) made it clear that seed money and follow-up money are essential. A small Caribbean country will not have funds to purchase fishing boats and so forth. The availability of follow-up money will determine the

oceanographic and marine science because of WHOI sponsorship. We should be talking about a broad based cooperative science project.

PAUL FYE (WHOI) believes professional reorientation is a good idea. The difficult part is convincing countries to voluntarily make a transition. We cannot force countries or individuals to develop a balanced program; we can only make it look exciting and inviting. At the same time, we must not avoid marine science; it is our area of competence and that competence will show.

DOROTHY BJUR added that such a program would help countries to help themselves. We must make certain that we go beyond the tutorial approach and start right away with educational institution building and expansion.

STELLA VALLEJO commented that there is still uncertainty as to the purpose of the program, as to its long and short-term goals, and planning or policy objectives. There are different ways to interpret what has been said. We are talking the same language but applying different interpretations. Policy issues must be seen from a longer perspective. "Planning" has not yet been discussed. Countries should be encouraged to include marine and coastal priorities and needs in the preparation of their National Development Plans NDP's (usually every five years). The higher levels of the government will deal with broader based issues (formulation of policy), while the planning level will be concerned with programs and projects. Training assistance programs should be aimed at both levels.

MELVIN CONANT summarized that the MPOM Program can help with the planning process; help the partner country to think through the options it has available and to arrive at a rational decision.

ED TOWLE suggested we look at the possibility of actually expanding current National Development Plans to cover marine related issues.

RICHARD PRICE (MPOM) stressed the importance of the product and content of Stage I and II of the PDP. As described, Stage I sounds like a survey course in marine policy while Stage II is more problem specific. It might be more reasonable to educate people as to the theories and histories of marine policy through actual problem solving. What are the needs of these developing countries? Are they interested in philosophy or in solving problems?

#

May 1982

DISTRIBUTION FOR SEA GRANT REPORTS

No. of Copies

Address

3

National Sea Grant Depository  
Pell Marine Science Library  
University of Rhode Island  
Kingston, RI 02881

5

Communications Specialist  
NOAA, Office of Sea Grant  
6010 Executive Blvd.  
Rockville, MD 20852

25

NOAA  
Environmental Data & Info. Serv., ESIC D  
11400 Rockville Pike  
Rockville, MD 20852

1

Sea Grant Today  
Editor, Food Science and Technology  
VPI & SU  
Blacksburg, VA 24061

<b>REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE</b>		1. REPORT NO. WHOI-82-38	2.	3. Recipient's Accession No.
4. Title and Subtitle WORKSHOP ON COOPERATIVE INTERNATIONAL MARINE AFFAIRS			5. Report Date August 1982	6.
7. Author(s) James Broadus, Robert W. Knecht, David A. Ross, Kurt Shusterich and Maynard Silva			8. Performing Organization Rept. No.	
9. Performing Organization Name and Address Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution Woods Hole, Massachusetts 02543			10. Project/Task/Work Unit No.	11. Contract(C) or Grant(G) No. (C) (G)
12. Sponsoring Organization Name and Address William H. Donner Foundation, Pew Memorial Trust, and the Johnson Endowment Fund			13. Type of Report & Period Covered Technical	
14.				
15. Supplementary Notes This report should be cited as: Woods Hole Oceanog. Inst. Tech. Rept. WHOI-82-38.				
16. Abstract (Limit: 200 words) This report details the results of a workshop held at the Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution (WHOI) on April 20-21, 1982. The workshop, part of an effort by the Marine Policy and Ocean Management Program (MPOM) of WHOI intended to assist interested developing countries in formulating strategies for ocean resource use and mangement within their new 200-mile exclusive economic zones. The effort, presently called the Cooperative International Marine Affairs Progran (CIMAP), began in November of 1981 after the William H. Donner Foundation of New York City responded favorably to a proposal submitte by Dr. David A. Ross, Director of MPOM. Following a section on the purpose of the workshop, this report contains two principal sections: 1) Workshop Discussions and 2) Conclusions. Topics covered in the Workshop Discussions section are: . Background of the CIMAP program . Discussion of Key Issues - Identifying Potential Partner Countries - Ascertainig Developing Country Needs - Shaping the Program Appendices contain the list of workshop participants, the agenda, and a summary of roundtable contributions.				
17. Document Analysis a. Descriptors 1. Marine Affairs 2. International Programs 3. Cooperative Programs  b. Identifiers/Open-Ended Terms  c. COSATI Field/Group				
18. Availability Statement			19. Security Class (This Report) Unclassified	21. No. of Pages 36
			20. Security Class (This Page)	22. Price



